



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE LYCÉES OF FRANCE

ADMINISTRATION AND DISCIPLINE

IN a former article upon the French lycée the discussion was limited to the program of studies and methods of teaching. This article will deal with some aspects of the administration of the lycées, and with their more general rules of discipline.

In what was said about programs and methods, attention was called to the fact that uniform curricula for all lycées, dictated by the ministry of education, furnish an excellent example of the centralization of French institutions—a centralization that is carried out so logically in the administrative offices of the lycées that a professor in one of the more prominent of them describes it as fairly “paralyzing.” “Our need, our pressing need,” he says, “is for some relaxation of the paralyzing centralization. And, unfortunately, the problem is so complicated with us, and made so difficult by old usage, by the absence of real living organisms anywhere out of the state, that I don’t see any hope of improvement in the near future. Whatever you do (in America), beware of that perfection of harmonious machinery which is our system of secondary instruction. But I doubt not you shall know how to stop in proper time.” Fortunately, there are not wanting signs that we shall avoid the error of bureaucracy in education, in spite of the efforts that are being put forth in that direction in the organization of the machinery of school superintendence in some of our states.

There is at present no code or collected body of the many decrees, laws, or explanatory circulars that define the administrative limits of the organization of the French system of secondary education, although the legislation for the primary and superior systems of public instruction has been codified. I am able, however, to indicate quite fully the official relations of the lycée to the state, by the courtesy of Professor L. Morel, of the

Lycée Louis le Grand, to whom I am indebted for many of the details that follow relative to this matter.

One is surprised, however much he expected it from his previous experience of the Gallic love of the explicit, to note the infinite pains taken by the ministry of education to prescribe the minutiae of the administrative life of the lycées—the thousand and one details of internal discipline and of the material and moral life of the student. To illustrate, the lycées of Paris announce in their prospectuses, which have been “viewed and approved” by the vice-rector of the Academy of Paris, that they defray “the cost of the ordinary medicaments prescribed by the house physician,” but that “the lycée relegates to the charge of the family any exceptional régime or special medicines necessitated by a debilitated constitution, or maladies contracted outside of the establishment—such are *antiscorbutic syrups*, *cod-liver oil*, *ferruginous preparations*, etc.” In another matter of hygiene we would not quarrel with the directors of the lycées on the score of the exactness of the rule that, “one Saturday of each month, the resident students take a complete bath in an establishment in the neighborhood, to which they are conducted by a tutor. On the other Saturdays they take foot baths in the house.” Indeed, I have heard of two head masters of private schools, one of whom makes neglect by the student to take a shower bath immediately after his daily exercise a serious breach of discipline, while the other requires his students to record their baths, who would doubtless maintain, in this particular at least, the superiority of Anglo-Saxon over Latin institutions. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that the personal life of the French student is carefully—too carefully, we must believe—watched and guarded, being subject, as in every other feature of his education, to the supervision of a body of inspectors, “representing, wherever they go, the all-seeing and all-directing authority of the minister of education.”

There are, however, besides the lycées, secondary schools that once enjoyed some measure of autonomy. These are the municipal colleges. While in them, as in the lycées, the state appoints every employé, from the head master down to the

teachers of gymnastics and fencing, the head, or "principal" of the college had formerly a certain independence in the material administration of his house. His profits were in proportion to the number of his students, so that he had personal as well as professional motives for working for the success of his school. Moreover, many towns took a local pride in their colleges which tended toward the development of an individuality in each institution. About ten years ago, however, the central authority, thinking that the dignity of the "principal" suffered by reason of his being permitted to make money as a shopkeeper might do, substituted a fixed salary for his proportionate share of profits; but as this change has resulted, in many places, in a decrease in the prosperity of the colleges, there is observable a tendency to return to the old method of compensation. These municipal institutions are supported by the state only in part, yet as far as the program of studies is concerned they are as completely controlled by the state as are the lycées.

While the lycées are maintained by the state, and all of their professors, officers, ushers and servants are public functionaries paid out of the state funds, yet they are not free schools. Resident boarding students, or pensionnaires, are charged from 1300 to 1650 francs per annum, according to class, the charges increasing as the student passes from the fourth class to the classes in philosophy, etc. The demi-pensionnaires, who enjoy all of the advantages of study accorded to pensionnaires, and who are permitted to take the midday meal and the afternoon luncheon at the lycée, pay from 750 to 1050 francs per annum. Externes, or day scholars, are charged a tuition varying from 350 to 500 francs. These charges for tuition, etc., are considerably lower than similar charges in first-class schools in America, and it will readily be seen that, discounted as they are by large sums remitted on account of the "bursiers," students on the foundation, and "pensionnaires libres," they are by no means sufficient to defray the expenses of establishments as completely equipped as are the lycées. The tariffs quoted above do not, of course, cover the student's total expense account. There are the usual extra charges for piano, fencing, dancing, and riding lessons, an

"abonnement" of six francs per annum for concerts, and a charge of ten francs or more for conveying candidates to the higher government schools for the entrance examinations. Each student must furnish his own trousseau, which is prescribed in detail; but the lycée furnishes the text-books used in the study of the classics, and paper, pens, etc., for class-room work. Fathers of large families are rewarded for the fulfillment of a public duty by being given a discount on tuition proportionate to the number of their children in the state schools, the amount varying from one eighth for two children to three sixteenths for four. These discounts, and the tendency toward a decrease in the number of pensionnaires, must still further deplete the peculiar sources of revenue of the lycée, while adding to the charge upon the public budget.

Undoubtedly the greatest single item of expense in maintenance is to be found in the salaries paid the numerous administrators, officers, teachers, and servants connected with the lycées. The staffs of all of them are organized upon a uniform plan. At the head of each establishment is a proviseur, or head master, who is assisted in its management by a secretary, a censeur and an économiste. The censeur is the proctor or disciplinarian of the school, and the économiste is its bursar. There is also a house physician, usually an advanced student in the University of Paris, who has the supervision of the nurses in the infirmary and of the administration of the remedies prescribed by the physicians attached to the lycée. Then there are the "repetiteurs," or tutors, who accompany the students to the baths, upon excursions, etc., and who sleep in the dormitories. The masters proper do not ordinarily live in the school, and are to be found there only upon the occasion of a recitation, or one of the weekly conferences that are held for certain classes. Not many of the professors have more than ten hours of work a week, and there are, therefore, proportionately, more of them than are to be found in our public secondary schools; but if they teach a comparatively small number of hours, they have large classes, except in modern languages.

These external appearances of the administrative machinery

of the lycée are not nearly so interesting as its "régime intérieur," a glimpse of which gives one some notion of the true spirit in which the conduct of the institution is regulated. The pensionnaires are separated into four divisions, each of which has its own playground, study hall, refectory, and dormitory. The grouping of classes in these divisions varies in different schools. In one of them, the first division consists of the students of the classes in science; the second, of the classes in philosophy and rhetoric; the third, of the students of the second and third classes; the fourth, of the youngest students, those of the fourth class or form. When students below the fourth or fifth class are admitted into the same institution with older boys, they usually occupy a separate set of buildings called the *Petit Lycée*.

Parents or guardians wishing to send a boy to one of the lycées must first fill out the blank forms of a statement of the applicant student's age, residence, religion, etc., and the modern language he will take, and this paper the parent signs under the affirmation:

I declare that I have taken cognizance of the conditions announced in the prospectus, and engage myself to conform to them completely.

The student, upon entering the lycée, must present his certificate of registration of birth, a certificate of vaccination, a certificate of good conduct, and a certificate that he has quitted all charges at the institution previously attended. New students must be presented by the parent in person, or by his correspondent. The latter is a responsible person, designated by the parent, who is willing to take charge of the pensionnaire whose parents do not live in town. He must have time to accompany the student upon the weekly or fortnightly *sortie* or excursion. The parent must not only name a correspondent, but he must also designate the several persons who may visit the student or correspond with him. Visits, even by parents, may be made only at stated times: 12:30 to 1:30 and from 4 to 5 o'clock on lesson days, and on Sundays from 11 to 12 o'clock and from 4 to 5 o'clock. Each lycée has its public parlors, and in these alone may the parent see his son, unless the boy is ill.

It is rarely possible for a parent to visit the class room, and

then only upon permission given in writing by the superior authorities; in fact, nothing could illustrate better than does the attitude of the lycée to the parent the truth that democracy in France has not gone beyond government "for" the people. For, while a student's parents are kept informed as to his conduct and his progress in his studies by reports made at the end of every trimester, they are not considered competent to criticise either the disciplining or the instruction of their sons. Education is an art; its technique may not be comprehended by the ordinary man; it is the affair of experts, who demand the same deference from the layman as is expected from him by lawyers or doctors skilled in the mysteries of their professions. Doubtless there is something to be said in favor of this professional attitude, shared by French in common with other continental teachers; and it undoubtedly explains the curious impatience with which class-room visits, the coöperation of women's school alliances, etc., are viewed by teachers of foreign birth and education who have found their way into our schools. But, in spite of the fads that are sometimes foisted upon our schools by individuals who make reform a profession, and who take advantage of the American teacher's belief that it is his duty to coöperate with the community he serves, there is no doubt but that the schoolroom benefits by the consciousness that it is always open to the criticisms suggested by the healthy common sense of the lay mind. Yet professional skill and authority must be recognized and conserved; some middle ground must be found between the intolerable meddling of Cleon and the equally intolerable meddling of the Ephors.

An attempt has been made to find such middle ground in France; or, at any rate, the necessity of the intelligent coöperation of the family has been formally recognized and advocated. A commission, appointed by the central authority in 1888 to investigate and report upon the administration of the lycées, submitted its conclusions in 1890, devoting a chapter of its report to the subject under discussion. After adverting to the fact that the lycées, being of a type either military or religious, have regarded themselves less as continuing than as reforming

the work of parents, following in spirit the rule of Mme. de Maintenon, who would not allow parents to visit at Saint Cyr more than four times a year, and then only for a brief half hour, the commission declared :

Far other is the ideal, wholly civil and not at all cloistral, which we have in mind. . . . One of the points with which we have been the most occupied has been to find the means of associating the family most closely with the educative work of the lycée.

So much for the wish and the theory—the condition is still that the parent knows little more of the inner workings of the lycée than he gleans from the statistics of the trimestrial report of his son's progress. Old usage does indeed make a reform that is largely social very slow of accomplishment in France.

If the attitude of proviseur and professor toward the parent be still such as has been sketched above, it can be imagined that it is even more superior when the student himself is concerned. I do not mean at all to imply that the student is not treated with sufficient kindness and respect, but only to indicate that in no implication of the term do his surroundings encourage him to self-government and initiative. In the previous article, attention was called to the fact that the self-activity of the student, which is encouraged in our secondary schools in the form of student organizations and enterprises, as it is in other ways in the kindergarten, is not developed by the régime of the lycée; while any such student participation in school government as is found, for example, in the Hyde Park High School in Chicago would be utterly foreign to the French mind. It is true that in the report referred to above, the value of student organizations in promoting self-development is recognized, and that the lycées are urged to encourage the formation of them; but, for reasons to be stated later, as little has been accomplished in this direction as in securing the coöperation of the home.

When it comes to the control of the student as an individual, we find him under much greater restraint than we would consider proper. Beyond the rules with which we are familiar in our own boarding schools concerning indiscriminate letter writing, spending of pocket money, and confinement within

bounds, etc., the French schools have so hedged the student about with a multitude of petty restrictions that he must feel either that, as a matter of course, he cannot be trusted, or that tutelage is the normal condition of life. Until he is seventeen years of age, the pensionnaire may not leave the precincts of the lycée unless he is accompanied by "his father, mother, tutor, or authorized correspondent;" and when he goes out he must wear the regulation uniform. At the age of seventeen, he may, upon occasion, go out alone; provided, however, that he has secured permission to go from the proviseur on the evening, in some cases on the Friday, before the sortie. In one lycée, the proviseur must be notified, on the evening before the contemplated sortie, that the student is expected by his parents or correspondent, when the applicant is given a "feuille de route" which indicates the hour of his departure, and must show, upon his return, the hour of his reception by the person awaiting him, and the hour that he took leave of his correspondent to return to the lycée. "Every student demi-pensionnaire must have a memorandum book in which the *répétiteur* writes daily notes, and which the parents must sign (visé) each day." "Externes may have no communication whatever with internes." Contrast the mental attitude which such discipline must develop with that of the bird-nesting, keeper-harrying Tom Brown or Stalky, and we are again made to see the reason why France produces no younger sons. In this connection, the writer remembers a scene characteristic of French schoolboy life which he witnessed while making a bicycle journey upon the splendid "route nationale" leading into Rheims. Far ahead was a long procession, at that distance so dark and somber that it looked fairly funereal. Nearer approach, however, revealed the boys of an ecclesiastical lycée situated in the environs of the city returning from one of their regular excursions. Although they carried hand balls and a football or two, and seemed merry enough, the fact that they were marched along by classes in regular formation, attended by numerous watchful priests, showed how little of boyish initiative or spontaneity there was about the whole affair. Again, I was better

able to understand how, to the French youth who dare not go to the colonies, or to the New World, or even away from his native town, for fear that he will lose the "protection" he enjoys at home, the Emersonian injunction to "cast the bantling on the rocks" would seem nothing but a wanton brutality. The gymnasia of Germany do not produce a temper much better, if one may so judge from the statement of an American, resident at a German university, who says, in writing to one of our leading weekly journals, that German boys "are kept in school under a discipline so strict as to prevent the development of a manly, self-reliant character."

The regulation of the French student's daily life might be described, if he be a pensionnaire, as a sort of military communism. The American and English boarding school practice of lodging boys in "cubicles," or in separated rooms, is unknown. Students are lodged by classes in dormitories containing long rows of single beds with lockers at their heads—the whole arrangement suggesting the barrack bedroom or the hospital. The appointments of the dormitories and lavatories, their heating and ventilation, are, however, very good, especially in the newer buildings. As was said above, the students are classified, each division having its own dormitory, study hall, dining room, etc.—in some cases its own "cour de récréation." The student's life is thus doubly and narrowly communal—he has everything except a corner that he may call his own, and he must be always eating, sleeping, exercising, studying, and marching to the baths or to recreation in company with a crowd of fellow-students.

His food is prepared in large, clean kitchens, is carefully weighed, and is served according to a menu previously inspected by the house physician. His diet certainly does not err upon the side of fullness and too great variety—a breakfast of *café au lait* and bread at 7:30; a *dejeuner* of one meat, one vegetable, bread, and dessert at 12; a slight luncheon at 4:15; and dinner of soup, meat, and vegetables at 8 o'clock, seems a rather slender régime.

Articles of clothing are prescribed in detail, but need not be all of a kind, except, of course, in the case of the uniform. The

uniform consists of a hooded military cloak of blue cloth, a blue coat with gold-embroidered collar and uniform buttons, blue vest and trousers, and an embroidered cap.

It will be observed that up to this point only details of the student's material environment have been indicated, nothing having been said of the true inner life of the lycée, its atmosphere, traditions, and spiritual life. The reason for this silence is obvious—the real quality of any student life is incommunicable to one who has not lived it himself, unless, indeed, he can get breaths of it from the narrative of a Tom Brown or a Beetle. As the French Tom Brown does not exist, and as it is very doubtful if a school of rigid government discipline will ever produce him, this subject must be here dismissed with the recording of a few impressions—and it should be remembered that they are given merely as impressions.

Even the casual visitor to the lycées of a single city, as Paris, is impressed with something like a faint flavor of individuality in each one inspected. As this impression cannot be due to differences in régime or curriculum, it must be the result either of the tone of an administration or of associations invoked by an ancient architecture and historical tradition. The Lycée Louis le Grand, modern in all its appointments, for the most part new and magnificently built, seems an expression of the modern democracy, an impression heightened when one learns that it numbers Voltaire, Robespierrie, and Michelet among its former students. Nevertheless, this school was once a part of the old University of Paris, and afterwards a Jesuit college, until it was again taken possession of by the state. The Lycée Henri IV. built upon foundations, dating from the fourteenth century, of the Abbey of Saint Genevieve, whose life is depicted in a series of masterly mural paintings by Puvis de Chavannes in the neighboring Panthéon, is more steeped in historical tradition. With its so-called Tower of Clovis, its ancient chapel, and the old halls of the library of the canons of Saint Genevieve transformed into dormitories, it breathes the atmosphere of the ancient past. "Ancien Lycée Napoleon—College Henri IV.—Lycée Corneille" in former days, it has a history of transformations as a school,

through all of which its cloistered walks and gardens have preserved an air of quiet culture imbued with the classical and literary spirit. Pedestaled busts, placed in the midst of shrubs and flowers, have been raised to Delavigne and Victor Duruy, the latter of whom was a professor in the old Lycée Napoleon.

Another lycée of the Quartier Latin, the Lycée St. Louis, fits well into Professor Haskins general characterization of the lycée as an institution whose "methods of instruction are still largely tinged with the spirit of formalism and routine inherited from the Second Empire . . . a semi-military institution which has much of the appearance of barracks, and calls its pupils to class by the beating of a drum."

The question as to how much strength the associations suggested above may acquire in the reminiscent affections of graduates of a lycée can scarcely be answered, as it is a matter of individual temperament and impressionability. That there is a degree of affection for the old school, and that a feeling of comradeship is there developed, is attested by the existence, in connection with each lycée, of an "association amicale" whose declared aim is to "establish among old students a common center of friendly relations, to give upon all occasions aid and protection to old comrades, and to assure a patronage to those who need assistance in beginning their careers." These associations also give prizes to graduating students attaining the highest grades in conduct and studies.

Thus it is always a prize—a medal, the consecration of his studies with the baccalaureate, admission to the École Polytechnique or to St. Cyr, a government office—that the student has in view as the object of his studies. He is brought up in the knowledge that if he does his part faithfully, intelligently, *and according to the letter of the program*, the state will do the rest. The sum total, the resultant, then, of the influence of the lycée must be to reinforce the communistic tendencies of the genius of the French people.

It would be unfair to conclude this sketch of the administrative side of the lycée after having indicated only a few of its specific aspects as the bases for generalizations like the one just

given above—as unfair as to weigh a man's character according to the visible assets of his exterior life without reckoning with his ideals. Enlightened ideals worthy of the best pedagogy of any country, are today slowly transforming the administration of French secondary schools. Fortunately, these ideals proceed from the top, having their sources in the studies and experience of France's most eminent educators. Unfortunately, so the writer must believe, they have had the fate to become embodied in the decree and the governmental report—the report (referred to above) of the commission appointed in 1888.

This report, published together with an explanatory letter from the minister of public instruction, M. Leon Bourgeois, and a decree of twenty-three articles outlining a new discipline for the lycées, is a most admirable document. In it the commission has addressed itself to the problem, how to modify the military type in which the lycée was first conceived to the point of making it a school in self-government? To quote M. Bourgeois, the old discipline, the “discipline répressive . . . which contents itself with an apparent order and an exterior submission beneath which are concealed evil instincts, repressed but not corrected, and secret revolts which will break out at last,” must give way to the “discipline liberale,” which seeks “on the contrary, to reform a youth as much as to restrain him . . . which would touch the essential, the conscience, and obtain not that tranquillity upon the surface which does not endure, but an interior order—that is to say, the acquiescence of a pupil in a rule recognized as necessary.

To obtain this “substitution désirable de l'état de paix à l'état de lutte,” the commission recommended, and it was decreed, that punishments multiplied daily, such as the *piquet* (standing still in one place), the *pensum* (task), deprivation of recreation and rest—such punishments as are in essence merely corporal, “injurious to the work and the health of the student, making him hostile to his masters and irritating without amending him,” should be henceforth prohibited. Since 1890 the only punishments authorized have been the following: (1) The unfavorable report; (2) re-study of the lesson in whole or in

part; (3) assigned work corrected in whole or in part; (4) extra assignments; (5) detention upon holidays; (6) deprivation of the *sortie*; (7) exclusion from a class or a study; (8) suspension or expulsion.

Prescriptions of punishment, however, indicate discipline only in its narrowest sense, and the commission fully recognized that truth by elaborating methods by which discipline might be equated with the day's work and play, and by creating an organization through which the enforcement of rules in a certain uniformity of spirit might be secured. The organization referred to, the council of discipline, was ordered established in every lycée. It consists of the proviseur, the censeur ex officio, five professors, one "surveillant général" and two tutors elected by their colleagues. It meets regularly every three months for conference upon the morale of the lycée, and may be convoked in emergency by the proviseur.

So much for organization and rules. How far did the commission go in advocacy of institutional work as an essential part of any good scheme of discipline? It certainly went very far for a commission of Frenchmen; for, as has been remarked above, the report encouraged, although not without reservation, the establishment of student organizations, such as musical societies and literary and scientific clubs. The rendition of classic plays, a much-favored student enterprise in the Jesuit schools, is scarcely commended, still less the production of plays written by the students themselves. The advantages of the debating societies of the English school are fully appreciated; but the conclusion reached concerning their adaptableness to French needs should rejoice the shade of Carlyle, for topical recitations upon prepared subjects, delivered under the control of a master, are distinctly asserted to be a better preparation for public life than a premature imitation of juristical or parliamentary debates, which is said to encourage a seeking for effect rather than quality in argumentation and to develop a certain hardihood in speaking on topics concerning which the student is not well informed. This is an objection to the debating society which does not obtain, however, in this country, where even high-school

debates, not to mention intercollegiate contests, stimulate a voluntary preparation that involves severe labor, and a self-denial of which the French boy would be, as a rule, incapable.

Inherited incapacities of one sort and another make it impossible for the French to adopt the voluntary institutional work of English and American schools, much as they would like so to do. In this connection it is curious to note in their allusions to "old boys" and to Rugby, how much the commissioners of 1888 have been attracted by the liberal life of the English public school. "Above all," they say, "let the students themselves administer, in their associations, their own affairs and their own by-laws." Nevertheless this mandate has accomplished little to bring about the result desired; for, after a decade of agitation and a decade of experimentation in the Lycée Lakanal, the French have been unable to acclimate Anglo-Saxon school associations and games. The French Tacitus still exhorts in vain his fellow-citizens to emulate the vigor of the Goth.

A last word concerning some seeming inconsistencies in what has been said about the lycée. It may be urged, first, that criticism of the organization and discipline of the lycée has been wholly from the viewpoint of Anglo-American tradition—that when all is said, the lycée prepares its students for life from the French viewpoint as well or better than American or English schools prepare for the life that their students will live. This contention might hold if it were not true, as has been indicated above, that a measure of the dissatisfaction of leading French educators with their own methods coincides with the objections taken to them in this paper, and that this dissatisfaction has again come to a head in the very recent appointment, by the national chamber of deputies, of another commission to make inquiry into the subject of secondary education. There is little doubt that the report of this commission will result, sooner or later, in important and admirable reforms. Meanwhile the imperative reform, that without which all other reforms will soon become dead, remains unaccomplished; for, it will be observed, the change is again to proceed from the source of that "paralyzing centralization," against which French institutions,

like their Latin prototypes, seem to struggle in vain. And here there is opportunity for explanation of the second seeming inconsistency with which this article may be charged.

It was said in the earlier article that the French method of creating a program of studies by a central board of experts, has produced results superior to those attained by our extra-legal committees and the experimentation of a multitude of petty authorities; and the statement is probably true, for the curricula outlined in that article are superior in matter and arrangement to the curriculum actually followed in the average American secondary school. In support of this statement, it is only necessary to quote again from Professor Haskins' report to the Committee of Seven on the study of history in the lycées, to the following effect: "At present we have little to learn from their methods of instruction beyond the suggestions that may be derived from their clear and well-ordered text-books, and from the arrangement of topics in the program, which Matthew Arnold declared no educated man could read without profit—without being reminded of gaps in his knowledge and stimulated to fill them." Nevertheless, I believe that we have something better in America than this *imposed* harmony and completeness of arrangement—and what this is will be fully appreciated, if one reflects upon the significance of the method by which our most effective advances in secondary education have been accomplished—by the spontaneous but organized efforts of the teaching body itself, working through such unofficial, extra-legal boards as the Committee of Ten, the committees on college entrance requirements, and the Committee of Seven. For in them we have the very "living organisms outside of the state," so needed in France—and in noting the absence of such organisms as his reason for despairing for improvement in France in the near future, it seems to the writer that Professor Morel hits the nail squarely on the head.

Official reform too inevitably degenerates into official pedantry, or, if it does not, is still never as vital as the reform that shapes itself out of living needs rather than out of officially perceived desiderata. In contrast with the law-made reforms of

France, how admirable have been the reforms in our own schools, resulting from the reports of the committees named above. Representing a slowly-gathering conviction that changes were imperative, presented not as decrees but as adaptable recommendations and with the tremendous force of an organized, professional opinion, they have been adopted voluntarily and eagerly as ideals. They have invoked living enthusiasms that will in turn create other enthusiasms adequate to the demands and true spirit of our national life. Such reforms can never become petrified into a series of decrees.

They contain in their evolutionary character the corrective principle for too much exuberance. The wastes in our systems of higher and secondary education so unerringly pointed out by President Harper, would better be eliminated, not by the artificial methods of the modern trust, but as they are being corrected — by the natural gravitation of students and endowments to the greater foundations, and by our elastic system of accredited and affiliated schools. The elastic and unarbitrary supervision of our secondary schools by our universities, the admirable spirit of coöperation between their respective faculties, the de-centralization of our school organization until every state and every city constitutes an experiment station held sufficiently in check by the strong forces of imitation and the organized public opinion of the teaching body — these features of the organization of our system of education constitute the signs upon which we must base our belief that it is developing along right lines. In secondary education, especially, we seem to be avoiding the excessive particularism of England and the over-centralization of France; to be finding, if one may do himself the doubtful compliment of quoting his own analogy, a status midway between control by Cleon and control by the Ephors.

We shall continue in this happy condition if we continue to test our work by the standard of the student himself — not by the standard of an idol of administration, discipline, or pedagogy. If the mere formal content of education and its arrangement are getting to be much the same in all countries; if systems

of administration and discipline are approaching an ideal of international pedagogics, it is all the more essential that we should be true to ourselves in searching for the higher law governing our own American needs and destiny.

EDWARD L. HARDY

LOS ANGELES, CAL.